DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 461 HE 020 443

AUTHOR Thomas, Alice
TITLE The Role of Assessment in Minnesota Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 43p.; For related document, see HE 020 441. Paper collected as part of the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Evaluation Utilization; *Higher Education; Improvement Programs; *Information Needs; Institutional Research; Private Colleges; Public Colleges; Questionnaires; Technical Institutes
IDENTIFIERS *AAHE Assessment Forum; *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Views of the chief academic officers at Minnesota colleges concerning assessment were surveyed. Responses were received from 17 private colleges, 5 University of Minnesota campuses, 7 state universities, 18 community colleges, and 33 area vocational-technical institutes. For each type of institution, survey results are presented concerning: the extent of discussion and planning concerning assessment, the climate for assessment and obstacles, types of assistance needed to conduct assessments, the role of assessment, and the types of assessment information collected. To determine what assessment information was collected, a second questionnaire was sent to institutional research officials at the campuses. There appeared to be a high level of discussion and/or planning activity regarding quality and assessment in Minnesota institutions among faculty, administrators, and boards. The type of assessment discussion and planning varied with institutional type. With the exception of the vocational-technical institutes, the institutions supported focusing assessment on broadly defined outcomes rather than easily learned skills and knowledge. In general, the colleges wanted to tie assessment to improving instruction and including feedback to students. Appended are the questionnaires and average responses for each item. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED283461

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alice Thomas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 020 443

# The Role of Assessment in Minnesota Institutions of Higher Education

Assessment has come to the forefront through national attention on accountability and quality in higher education. It is viewed as a means of verifying and improving quality and, as such, promotes accountability in higher education.

The term assessment has been used loosely to mean the gathering of information to indicate the extent to which an institution is achieving what it purports to do . That is, to what extent is teaching and learning occurring at the institution? Are students growing in the intended dimensions as expressed in the institution's mission and reflected in the curriculum?

## National Context

Questions of quality and the role of assessment in improvement of quality have been the foci of many national reports within the last two years, e.g., the National Institute of Education's "Involvement in Learning" (1984), addressed student involvement, and advocated the setting of high expectations for students, and systematic assessment; the Association of American Colleges' "Integrity in the College Curriculum" (1985) addressed the absence of accountability, and proposed appropriate techniques for measuring student progress; the Southern Regional Education Board's "Access to Quality Undergraduate Education" (1986) concerned the maintenance of access, improving quality and the need for measures of student



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One Dupont Circle
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-6440

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

**Board of Directors**

*Chair*
Joseph F. Kauffman
University of Wisconsin
Madison

*Chair-Elect*
Adele S. Simmons
Hampshire College

*Vice Chair*
Reatha Clark King
Metropolitan State University

*Past Chair*
Harriet W. Sheridan
Brown University

Carlos H. Arce
NuStats, Inc.

Estela M. Bensimon
Teachers College
Columbia University

Anne L. Bryant
American Association of
University Women

Donald L. Fruehling
McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Ellen V. Futter
Barnard College

Jerry G. Gaff
Hamline University

Zelda F. Gamson
University of Michigan

Stephen R. Graubard
*Daedalus*

Joseph Katz
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

Arthur E. Levine
Bradford College

Frank Newman
Education Commission
of the States

Alan Pifer
Carnegie Corporation
of New York

W. Ann Reynolds
The California State
University

Piedad F. Robertson
Miami-Dade Community
College

D. Wayne Silby
Groupware Systems

P. Michael Timpane
Teachers College
Columbia University

**President**
**Russell Edgerton**

The AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM is a three-year project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. It entails three distinct but overlapping activities:

--an annual conference
(the first scheduled for June 14-17, 1987, in Denver)

--commissioned papers
(focused on implementation and other timely assessment concerns; available through the Forum for a small fee)

--information services
(including consultation, referrals, a national directory, and more)

This paper is part of an on-going assessment collection maintained by the Forum. We are pleased to make it more widely available through the ERIC system.

For further information about ASSESSMENT FORUM activities, contact Patricia Hutchings, Director, AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036

performance. The more recent report of the Education Commission of the States, "Transforming the State Role in Undergraduate Education" (1986), identified the challenges including assessment, and recommended direction to state leaders.

As might be expected, demands for accountability have been met in a variety of ways reflecting the diversity of institutions and their contexts. A recent article by Boyer and McGuiness (1986) provided an excellent overview of current state initiatives to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

To put the various developments into perspective, it is important to understand the context of the highly publicized assessment programs. The earliest and most intrusive assessment programs appear to have occurred at institutions in which quality was clearly becoming a problem and threat to the institution. Mingle (1985) has acknowledged the importance of context in assessment. He attributed the current intervention into areas traditionally reserved for faculty and institutions to several factors including the inability of institutions to maintain standards and provide expanded access simultaneously, the loss of confidence in grading practices of faculty, the failure of high schools to teach basic computation and communication skills, and the desire to extend successful "school-type" reforms to colleges and universities. It would seem reasonable to add the factor of financial crisis experienced in some states. These factors identified above do seem to be present in those states in which intervention has occurred.

Two national studies completed by the American Council on Education (Feb. 1986, August 1986) provided information about the current role of assessment in the various types of institutions in the U.S. Some of the general findings include the following: the recent national education reform reports were being widely discussed among senior administrators and faculty members; about one-fourth of the institutions reported that they had already changed their research and assessment programs as a result of the reform movement; and a similar proportion reported that they were planning to do so.

Minnesota Context

Given the context of quality and assessment in higher education in general, there is the question about the role that the issues of quality and assessment play in the institutions and states, such as Minnesota, in a context relatively free from or less encumbered by factors identified by Mingle. Thus, the American Council on Education (ACE) study results lead to the question of whether or not the trends were representative of the institutions in Minnesota.

Questions addressed in this project included some that were explored in the research of the ACE. Some of the ACE questionnaire items were repeated verbatim in the Minnesota questionnaire to provide comparable statistics. Additional questions were designed to provide more complete, illuminative information about the role of assessment in Minnesota institutions. The general questions addressed include: To what extent have assessment and quality discussions and establishment

of committees and/or assessment plans taken place? What conditions exist at the institutions that might affect assessment activity and use, e.g., attitudes, expertise, awareness, funds? To what extent are these conditions perceived as possible barriers to assessment activity? What type of assistance, if any, from other institutions, the state legislature, college consortiums might be helpful? What role should assessment play? Would an accountability assessment program be valuable to institutions; would a development/improvement assessment program be valuable to the institutions? What types of assessment information are gathered and for what purpose? Thus, the purpose of the survey of the institutions in Minnesota was to provide a general overview of current attitudes, practices and perceived barriers to assessment.

## Research Procedures

All eighty institutions of higher education in Minnesota were included in the survey. Each institution's chief academic officer was asked to complete and return by mail Questionnaire A, which addressed all questions identified above except the question about specific information gathered at the institution.

Questionnaire B contained questions about specific information gathered at the institution and the purpose of gathering the information. The academic officer was asked to forward Questionnaire B to the person at the institution who conducted institutional research activity. A few weeks after the initial mailing, a second mailing was completed to nonrespondents. Subsequently, telephone calls were made to most

of the institutions returning the questionnaires for clarification of particular items and to respond to questions.

The total number of institutions receiving the survey by institutional type, and the return rates of Questionnaire A and Questionnaire B respectively were as follows: Private Institutions, (n=17), 88%, 82%; University of Minnesota campuses, (n=5), 80%,80%; State Universities (n=7), 86%,86%; Community Colleges, (n=18), 89%, 83%; Area Vocational-Technical Institutes (AVTIs), (n=33), 91%, 88%. The results below are provided by type of institution.

## Results

### Private Institutions

Assessment Discussion and Planning. There are indications that within the private institutions, issues of assessment and quality of education have been discussed widely - among senior administrators, faculty and trustees. During the last two years, a majority of the institutions reported having established a new task force or committee, or assigned an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education (see table 1a).

The telephone follow-up interviews revealed that the objects of the assessments varied considerably from a specific program, e.g., a new program, to the overall institutional program as defined by an institution's mission and goals. Regardless of the object of the assessment, this survey did indicate an overall high level of discussion about quality and assessment in these

institutions. The level of the discussions was greater than in similar institutions included in the ACE national survey.

Assessment Climate and Obstacles. Several items in the questionnaire related to the climate for assessment at the institutions. Several possible institutional conditions were listed. The chief academic officers were first asked to indicate to what extent the conditions existed at their institutions and secondly, given that condition, to what extent it served as an obstacle to establishing or using an assessment program at their institutions.

Indications of general awareness and support can be found in items a,b and f,g respectively (see table 1a). Awareness and support seemed quite high on the part of administrators and therefore was not perceived as an obstacle at many institutions. There was an indication, however, that there might be somewhat less support among faculty than administrators. The general level of faculty support was viewed as an obstacle at more of the institutions than the general level of support by administrators. However, the faculty support at Minnesota's private institutions was much greater than that reported by similar institutions in the national ACE survey.

The chief academic officers were asked to indicate to what extent their institutions had experienced pressure from the external environment for assessment in item 2c (see table 1a). As might be expected, about one-half of the private institutions reported experiencing essentially no pressure for assessment from their external environment with the remaining private

institutions reporting a wide range of experiences in the level of pressure.

Reports of the institutions' sense of how to begin an assessment program, a sense of what to evaluate and the presence of expertise at the institution can be found in the results of items 2d, e, n, and o (see table 1a). Having a clear sense of how to evaluate, and what to evaluate were perceived by about one-half of the respondents as being minor obstacles, while none indicated they were major obstacles. This was in sharp contrast to the ACE's study in which over one-third of the private institutions indicated that having a clear sense of what to evaluate was a major obstacle.

Conditions that were perceived as the greatest obstacles to assessment for the private institutions and the percent indicating they were a major obstacle were as follows: fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching and learning activities (14%), fear about misuse of assessment (15%), availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment programs (31%), a perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff (43%), and a perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments (50%). All of the above barriers were reported by similar institutions in the ACE sample as more serious barriers than the private Minnesota institutions perceived them to be.

An opportunity was provided on the questionnaire for the chief academic officers to indicate what additional obstacles to assessment existed at their institutions that were not identified

in the questionnaire. Responses from these private institutions included factors that were not mentioned by other institutional types. These obstacles included the lack of institutional research personnel, inadequate computer facilities and the lack of central institutional research data base.

Assistance Needed and Sought. The chief academic officers were asked to indicate what type of assistance, if any, their institution would find most helpful and what source they thought could appropriately provide that assistance. Again, assessment instruments and funding appeared as areas of needed assistance. This was consistent with the perceived barriers addressed earlier.

A majority of the institutions had availed themselves of the opportunity to learn more about assessment through conferences devoted entirely to assessment. The proportion doing so was higher for this group of institutions than for any other.

Role of Assessment. The last component of the survey completed by the chief academic officers related to various opinions about the role of assessment in higher education. As might be expected for these private institutions, there was a lack of agreement with statements advocating the use and publication of evidence of institutional effectiveness in items 5g, h and i (see table 1a).

Regarding the appropriate role of assessment, there was a tendency to favor assessment for improvement and development purposes over accountability purposes. Agreement with items 5c, d and j (see table 1a) are in support of improvement and

development and met with strong agreement by the institutions more often than statements e and k (see table 1a) which support assessment for accountability purposes.

Assessment Information Collected. Questionnaire B was sent to the individual at the institution who fulfilled the institutional research function. However, at several of the private institutions this form was also completed by the chief academic officers because there was no individual serving in the position of institutional researcher. At these institutions the institutional research function was fulfilled by several offices.

The results for these institutions indicate that information was gathered on the basic cognition skills primarily at entrance for use in meeting student needs for placement and advising (see table 1b). Information about knowledge and understanding, and higher level cognitive skills was collected by about one-half of the institutions and, if gathered, was used just as often for program improvement as for accountability purposes. Information about attitudes and values was gathered at most of the private institutions and was more likely to be used for program improvement than for accountability purposes. This collection of information about the higher level cognitive skills and affective domain skills by the private institutions was greater than for other institutional types. In general, the level of collection of information in all of the above areas were greater in these private institutions than in those included in the ACE survey.

University of Minnesota and State Universities.

Assessment Discussion and Planning. The results indicate much discussion about assessment and quality among regents, administrators, faculty and in departments at the public universities (see tables 2a and 3a).

In contrast to the private institutions, it appeared from the follow-up phone calls that the committees were addressing overall institution assessment. Many of these institutions were in the process of struggling with the complex issues of planning an overall assessment that would include identifying what an education means at their institution. Although only a few have an overall program currently in place, many are clearly well along the task of instituting such a plan in the near future. This level of discussion and planning in these Minnesota universities was higher than that of similar institutions in the ACE national survey.

Assessment Climate and Obstacles. At these institutions it appeared that there was a high level of awareness and support on the part of administrators. As seen earlier in the private institutions, that level of awareness and support was somewhat less for faculty, and the level of faculty support was perceived to be something of an obstacle at these institutions.

However, it should be noted here that in those institutions where there was active planning for comprehensive assessments, faculty were often instrumental in the initiation or were very supportive and active in the present work towards such a goal. Several chief academic officers emphasized how important it had been to their success that the program had been initiated by or

had gained the cooperation of faculty.

The areas consistently perceived to be major obstacles to assessment by the University of Minnesota campuses and the State Universities were, respectively, the availability of sufficient funds to development the assessment programs (75%,50%); fear of misuse of assessment results (50%,50%); the addition assessment would make to an already heavy workload (50%,50%); and the inadequacy of available instruments (50%,30%).

The perceived lack of a sense of how to begin, of what to evaluate, and of expertise to develop assessment procedures were seen as obstacles by the four campuses of the U. of Minnesota that responded. This probably reflects the unique complexity and diversity of the missions of these institutions. In fact, the complexity and diversity of the institution was identified as an additional obstacle for them that their chief academic officers noted was not listed in the questionnaire.

In general, the extent to which the conditions were perceived to serve as obstacles by these Minnesota universities was similar to that in the ACE national survey.

Assistance Needed and Sought. The types of assistance identified were consistent with the barriers to assessment identified earlier. Funding was identified as a need that could be met by the state legislature. The related needs of information, conferences and expertise were perceived as those that could appropriately be provided by other institutions and/or institutional consortiums.

Of the ten institutions in this group returning the questionnaire, representatives of five had attended conferences or workshops devoted entirely to assessment.

Role of Assessment. In general, these institutions supported focusing assessment on broadly defined outcomes rather than on easily learned skills and knowledge, tying assessment to improvement of instructions, and including substantial feedback to students in assessment.

There was some disagreement about whether institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness and whether states should require public institutions to show evidence of effectiveness.

Follow-up phone conversations provided insight into these results. In recognition that they are public institutions and thus accountable to the public, the chief academic officers perceived that it was appropriate to provide assessment results. The respondents acknowledged that information is needed by the public as assurance that the issues are being addressed. However, in light of the dangers of data misinterpretation out of context or in an unknown context, these institutions were concerned that the information be provided with care, e.g., providing aggregate results by system rather than by institution.

It should be noted that these views expressed by chief academic officers in the public universities in Minnesota are generally more supportive of using and sharing assessment information about effectiveness than similar institutions in the ACE survey conducted earlier this year.

The U. of Minnesota campuses did not differentiate in the perceived value of assessment for improvement vs. assessment for accountability as did the State Universities and the private institutions, the latter being more supportive of assessment for improvement than for accountability.

There was general agreement that the results of student assessment should be linked to analysis of institutional effectiveness and planning and budgeting. Such linkage of assessment results was clearly desired for internal use and decision making but was less desirable for external use.

Assessment Information Collected. Overall, little documentation of student growth and development was reported as being collected currently (see tables 2b and 3b). When collected it was usually in the areas of mathematics and English composition or communication to meet the needs of the students such as placement rather than for program improvement or accountability purposes. Seldom were the higher level cognitive skills and/or affective domain understandings or skills documented. However, the current level of this information collection is very similar to that reported by universities in the ACE survey. Based on current assessment plans, this level will undoubtedly increase in the next few years.

As in the private institutions, most of these institutions had documented outcomes of graduates related to subsequent earned degrees, job placement, etc.; had gathered some information from graduates about their general satisfaction with their education, usually for purposes of program improvement; and had evaluated

personnel and programs for purposes of improvement as well as accountability.

AVTIs and Community Colleges

Although the AVTIs and Community Colleges are not similar systems, they encounter some special, similar circumstances that affect the results of the survey. First, they both have open enrollment that brings a wide variety of student skills and abilities to their institutions. Thus, it is necessary for the institutions to measure the level of incoming student skills for the purpose of decisions about placement. Secondly, their students are not enrolled in a continual manner, i.e., term after term and year after year until the degree is granted, as is more typical of the pattern of the other institutions. This greatly limits the type and quality of information that is feasibly gathered about their students who may be very difficult if not impossible to track after completing a course.

Assessment Discussion and Planning. Because the questionnaires from these institutions were based on entry assessment, it is not surprising to find "assessment" so widely discussed among the board, administrators, and faculty (see tables 4a and 5a). Generally, the committees and plans reported in the survey reflect this entry assessment activity,. The AVTIs also included in their assessment activity the program placement evaluations they are required to conduct. The level of discussion activity of the community colleges was greater than that of similar institutions included in the ACE study.

Assessment Climate and Obstacles. As in other institutions, there is a high level of awareness and support of assessment by administrators, slightly less awareness and support of the concept by faculty; a lack of uniformity regarding a clear sense of what to evaluate and how to begin. These institutions also identified the major barriers as sufficient funds to develop programs, possible intrusion of assessment in teaching/learning and the perception that it would add to an already heavy workload for staff. However, they perceived the availability of expertise at their institutions to be a greater barrier than did other types of institutions.

The AVTIs identified the "time" required by assessment as an obstacle that was not included in the questionnaire. They appeared to be basing their concern on their experience from the current required evaluation activity. In general, the obstacles identified by Minnesota's community colleges were similar to comparable institutions in the ACE study with the exception of two related obstacles: possible inappropriateness of assessment for the institution's curriculum and the adequacy of available instruments.

Assistance Needed and Sought. Similar to other categories of institutions, this group identified funding most frequently as a needed type of assistance. However, in contrast to the other institutions whose next most frequent need was information, this group indicated a more specialized type of assistance in the form of training, technical assistance and consultants.

A minority of the institutions had attended a conference/workshop devoted entirely to assessment.

Role of Assessment. As would seem reasonable, the AVTIs were less likely to agree that assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes than did other types of institutions.

The telephone follow-up clarified the high level of agreement to the statements that the results of the assessment should be linked to analyses of institutions' effectiveness and planning and budgeting. Agreement to the statement was based on the assumption that the results were to be used for internal decision making and planning, and not for external judgements about institutional effectiveness.

The roles perceived as appropriate for the Minnesota community colleges were similar to those of comparable institutions in the national ACE survey.

Assessment Information Collected. Consistent with the context of these institutions, there was a high level of collection of information upon entrance in the areas of student mathematical, composition and reading skills for the purpose of meeting the student needs (see tables 4b and 5b). Seldom was information collected about other types of student development. As would be expected from the enrollment patterns of students at these institutions, the collection of information about graduates such as earned degrees was less than that at the other institutions in Minnesota.

They did, however, report substantial collection of information about job placement and satisfaction with their

education and, in the case of the AVTI's, with employer evaluation of job performance.

The level of information collected by Minnesotas community colleges was similar to that collected by comparable institutions in the ACE survey.

As with other institutions included in this survey, there was a relatively high level of evaluation of personnel, programs and facilities by the AVTIs and Community Colleges.

## Summary

There appeared to be a high level of discussion and/or planning activity regarding quality and assessment in the institutions in Minnesota among faculty, administrators and boards. In all institutional types included in the national ACE survey, this assessment activity was greater in Minnesota institutions than the institutions included in the national survey.

However, the type of assessment discussion and planning varied with institutional type. The private institutions appeared to concentrate their efforts on continuing their high level of assessment for improvement purposes. The focus of this assessment usually was not at the overall institutional level. Many of the public universities were actively planning comprehensive assessment programs. The community colleges and AVTIs reported a high level of discussion and assessment of student entry skill level for the purpose of placement.

Although there were some conditions that were perceived as obstacles to assessment by particular institutional types, there

were several conditions often perceived as major barriers regardless of type of institution. Those were as follows: perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments; fear about misuse of assessment results; availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment programs; and a perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff.

The types of needed assistance identified by the chief academic officers were consistent with the perceived barriers. The types of assistance that the respondents indicated would be helpful included funding, information in various forms, appropriate instruments and various types of technical assistance in the form of consultants, training, models, etc. The source identified as being appropriate for the funding was the state legislature. The other types of assistance were most often desired from other institutions or institutional consortiums. Only the AVTIs tended to identify the state agencies as an appropriate source for these types of assistance.

Conversations with chief academic officers indicate that within each system in Minnesota, there are at least a few excellent examples of the development of a credible comprehensive assessment program. Within a short period there should be an even greater number that can provide valuable guidance to others with information about a process as well as a possible model. Several of the chief academic officers who are at these institutions suggested that they are or soon will be at the point where they would be very willing and anxious to share their experiences and plans with others.

With the exception of the AVTIs the institutions supported focusing of assessment on broadly defined outcomes rather than easily learned skills and knowledge. In general, the institutions supported tying assessment to improving instruction and including feedback to students.

The extent of agreement with statements advocating the linking of student assessment to analyses of institutional effectiveness and to planning and budgeting was not consistent. Such use of results appeared to meet with high approval for internal purposes but was considered less favorably for external uses. Although the chief academic officers of the institutions in Minnesota seemed more favorably disposed to providing the public with assessment information than institutions in other states, their responses did include caveats regarding the nature of the information that might be released to minimize possible misinterpretation and damage.

The private institutions and the State Universities differentiated between the value of assessment for accountability purposes versus for development purposes while other institutions did not. These institutions indicated that assessment for development purposes would be of somewhat greater value than assessment for accountability purposes.

In general, the scope of information and the proportion of institutions collecting the information in Minnesota institutions were generally equal to or sometimes greater than institutions in the national ACE sample. Institutions in Minnesota conducted more assessment of students' basic skills upon entry for placement

purposes than did institutions in the national ACE sample. The private colleges in Minnesota conducted more assessment of higher level cognitive skills than did similar institutions in the national ACE survey.

Alice M. Thomas

February 1987

## Bibliography


Access to Quality Undergraduate Education. (1985). Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Boyer, C. M. and McGuinness Jr., A. C. (Feb. 1986). State Initiatives to Improve Undergraduate Education: ECS Survey Highlights. AAHE Bulletin, 38(6).

El-Khawas, E. (Feb. 1986). Campus Trends, 1985. American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel Report Number 71.

El-Khawas, E. (August 1986). Campus Trends, 1986. American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel Report Number 73.

Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community. (1985). Washington, D. C. Association of American Colleges.

Mingle, J. R. (1985, Jan). Measuring the Educational Achievements of Undergraduates: State and National Developments. Denver: State Higher Educaion Officers.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984, Oct.). Involvement in Learning: Realizaing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education.

Transforming the State Role in Undergraduate Education. (July 1986). Denver: Education Commission of the States.

PRIVATES n=17

No. returned - 15
Response rate - 88%

Table 1a

Part A - To be complete by Chief Academic Offic

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Please indicate which of the following has occurred at your institution within the last two years regarding the issues of assessment and the quality of education.

| | Yes n | Yes % | Planned n | Planned % | No n | No % | Don't know n | Don't know % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Discussion | | | | | | | | |
| a. with members of the board/trustees/regents | 13 | (87%) | - | ( %) | 2 | (13%) | | - |
| b. among senior administrators | 15 | (100%) | - | ( %) | - | ( %) | | - |
| c. in institutional faculty meetings | 12 | (86%) | 2 | (14%) | - | ( %) | | - |
| d. in some academic departments | 15 | (100%) | - | ( %) | - | ( %) | | - |
| e. in some administrative departments | 15 | (100%) | - | ( %) | - | ( %) | | - |
| f. in specially convened institutional meetings | 7 | (50%) | - | ( %) | 7 | (50%) | | - |
| g. with outside consultants | 11 | (73%) | - | ( %) | 4 | (27%) | | - |
| 2. Establishment of a new task force/committee or assignment of an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education. | 9 | (64%) | 2 | (14%) | 3 | (21%) | | - |
| 3. Have established an assessment plan | 8 | (53%) | 4 | (27%) | 3 | (20%) | | - |

2. For each of the following, please indicate -
   A. to what extent the condition exists at your institution and
   B. given that condition, to what extent it serves as an obstacle to establishing/using an assessment program at your institution.

| | Extent of Condition at Your Institution | | | | | Condition as an Obstacle to Assessment at Your Institut | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Essentially not at all | A little | Some-what | Much | Exten-sive | Not an obstacle | Minor obstacle | Major obstacle |
| a. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key administrators. | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 2 | - |
| | - | - | 33% | 33% | 33% | 86% | 14% | - |
| b. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key faculty/faculty committees. | - | - | 5 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 5 | - |
| | - | - | 33% | 40% | 27% | 64% | 36% | - |
| c. Pressure from the external environment (public, board members/regents, etc.) for assessment. | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 1 | - |
| | 47% | 13% | 27% | 7% | 7% | 93% | 7% | - |
| d. A clear sense of how to begin an assessment program. | - | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | - |
| | - | 7% | 40% | 27% | 27% | 50% | 50% | - |
| e. A clear sense of what to evaluate. | - | - | 7 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 8 | - |
| | - | - | 47% | 33% | 20% | 43% | 57% | - |
| f. General administrative support of the concept of assessment. | - | - | 2 | 7 | 6 | 14 | - | - |
| | - | - | 13% | 47% | 40% | 100% | - | - |
| g. General faculty support of the concept of assessment. | - | - | 9 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 6 | - |
| | - | - | 60% | 33% | 7% | 54% | 46% | - |
| h. A perception that students would be unhappy with new forms of assessment. | 7 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 8 | 6 | - |
| | 50% | 21% | 29% | - | - | 57% | 43% | - |
| i. Fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching/learning activities. | 2 | 6 | 5 | 2 | - | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| | 13% | 40% | 33% | 13% | - | 29% | 57% | 14% |
| j. The opinion that assessment may be inappropriate for the insitution's curriculum. | 8 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 9 | 4 | - |
| | 53% | 20% | 27% | - | - | 69% | 31% | - |
| k. Fear about misuse of assessment results. | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | - | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| | 27% | 33% | 33% | 7% | - | 39% | 46% | 15% |
| l. Perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments. | - | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 | - | 7 | 7 |
| | - | 20% | 40% | 33% | 7% | - | 50% | 50% |
| m. Availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment program. | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| | 27% | 20% | 33% | 13% | 7% | 39% | 31% | 31% |
| n. Expertise at institution to develop assessment procedures. | - | - | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 5 | - |
| | - | - | 20% | 60% | 20% | 64% | 36% | - |
| o. Expertise at institution to assist in interpreting and utilizing results. | - | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 4 | - |
| | - | 13% | 13% | 53% | 20% | 71% | 29% | - |
| p. A perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff. | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| | 7% | 40% | 20% | 13% | 20% | 7% | 50% | 43% |

## Table 1a (continued)

3. a. What, if any, are additional obstacles to assessment at your institution that were not identified in question 2 on page 1? What opportunities for assessment exist at your institution?

Obstacles

2 Insufficient computer facilities/data base
2 No Institutional Researcher
1 Inappropriate instruments
1 Cumbersome committee process

b. To address the obstacles to assessment at your institution, please indicate what type of assistance, if any, your institution would find most helpful and which specific group you think could appropriately provide that assistance.

| n | Type of assistance most helpful (specify) | Appropriate source of assistance (check): Other institutions | State Legislature | Institutional consortiums | State agencies | No specific group in mind |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Funding | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | Expertise/consultants | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 |
| 2 | Instruments | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
| 2 | Workshops/conferences | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| 1 | Information about models used by other inst. | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| 1 | Peers group norms | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| 1 | Instruments (development) | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| 1 | Information through mailings | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| 2 | Instruments | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |

4. Do you know of individuals in your institution who have attended conferences/workshops devoted entirely to assessment (e.g., National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education Conference held in South Carolina in October 1985, Assessment in Higher Education Conference at the University of Minnesota in July 1986)?

| | | n | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Yes | 9 | 64% | If yes, please specify conference(s), Alverno College Assessment Procedures, Wisc. (n=1), Value Added Learning, Saratoga Springs, N.Y. (n=1), National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, S.C. (n=3), Assessment in Higher Education, U. of Minn. (n=6) |
| 2. | No | 5 | 36% | |

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Use of nationally standardized tests for purposes of student assessment risks distorting the educational process. | n | - | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| | | % | - | 33% | 27% | 27% | 13% |
| b. | Student assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes and competencies, not on easily learned skills and knowledge. | n | - | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 |
| | | % | - | 13% | 13% | 33% | 40% |
| c. | Student assessment should be closely tied to efforts to improve instruction. | n | - | - | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| | | % | - | - | 7% | 33% | 60% |
| d. | Student assessment should include substantial feedback to students. | n | - | - | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| | | % | - | - | 7% | 67% | 27% |
| e. | Results of student assessment should be linked to analyses of institutional effectiveness. | n | - | 1 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| | | % | - | 7% | 20% | 53% | 20% |
| f. | Results of student assessment should be linked to institutional planning and budgeting. | n | - | 2 | 3 | 8 | 2 |
| | | % | - | 13% | 20% | 53% | 13% |
| g. | All institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness. | n | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 |
| | | % | 13% | 7% | 27% | 47% | 7% |
| h. | As a condition of accreditation, institutions should be required to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| | | % | 13% | 7% | 13% | 53% | 13% |
| i. | States should require public institutions to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| | | % | 7% | 13% | 13% | 53% | 13% |
| j. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in assisting us to better understand our functioning and how we could improve. | n | - | - | 1 | 9 | 5 |
| | | % | - | - | 7% | 60% | 33% |
| k. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in its assistance to answer questions from outside the institution about our quality and effectiveness. | n | 1 | - | 4 | 9 | 1 |
| | | % | 7% | - | 27% | 60% | 7% |

6. Other comments about assessment or quality of education issues:

RIVATES n=17

Table 1b

institutional researcher or equivalent

o. returned - 14
esponse rate - 82%

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*ections: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

Listed below are many types of information about students/graduates, each of which may be more appropriate for some institutions than for others. Please indicate which, if any, have been collected at some time during the last five years and for what purpose(s) (indicate as many purposes as apply).

| | Has information been collected within last five years? | | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, at entrance | Yes, during process | Yes, at exit | No | Program improvement | Meet student needs (e.g., placement, advising) | Account-ability | Don't know purpose |
| **A. Areas of growth/development** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Basic cognitive skills | 13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 3 | - |
| (a) mathematical skills | 13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 3 | - |
| (b) English composition/communication | 13 | 4 | 3 | - | 5 | 11 | 4 | - |
| (c) reading | 6 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 2 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| 2. Knowledge/understanding | | | | | | | | |
| (a) general education subjects (e.g., history, humanities, science) | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | - |
| | | | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | - |
| (b) other specific content areas (e.g., area of major) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | - |
| (c) technical subjects | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | 2 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| 3. Higher level skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) critical thinking | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | - |
| (b) problem solving | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | - |
| (c) communication(e.g., to persuade) | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | - |
| (d) technical skills | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | - |
| (e) other (specify _____) | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 4. Affective understanding/skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) attitudes | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 3 | - |
| (b) values | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | - |
| (c) human relations/leadership skills | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| **B. Student Progress** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Withdrawals from courses | | 5 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | - |
| 2. Repeats of courses | | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3 | - |
| 3. Graduation rates | | | 14 | - | 7 | 4 | 11 | - |
| 4. Other (specify _____) | | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| **C. General outcomes of graduates** | | | Yes | No | | | | |
| 1. Enrollment in graduate/professional school | | | 13 | 1 | 6 | | 9 | 1 |
| 2. Additional earned degrees(e.g., Diplomas, Associate, Bachelors) | | | 7 | 6 | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| 3. Advanced earned degrees (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) | | | 7 | 5 | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| 4. Professional attainment | | | 9 | 2 | 7 | | 6 | - |
| 5. Job Placement | | | 13 | - | 11 | | 9 | - |
| 6. Honors and other achievements | | | 6 | 7 | 3 | | 3 | 1 |
| 7. Employer evaluation of job performance | | | 2 | 8 | 3 | | 3 | - |
| 8. Contribution to community | | | 2 | 8 | 1 | | 1 | - |
| 9. Indices of alumni giving | | | 11 | 2 | 6 | | 4 | - |
| 10. General satisfaction with education, etc. | | | 11 | 2 | 10 | | 6 | - |
| 11. Other (specify _____) | | | - | 1 | - | | - | - |

## Table 1b (continued)

2. Which of the following aspects are evaluated at your institution and for what purpose(s) (indicate either or both purposes as applicable)?

| Aspect of Institution | Has an evaluation been conducted? | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, annually | Yes, at least once in last 5 years | No | Development/ Improvement | Accountability/ Administrative decisions | Don't know purpose |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| a. Personnel | | | | | | |
| (1) Administration | 7 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 10 | - |
| (2) Faculty | | | | | | |
| (a) by peers | 7 | 7 | - | 12 | 10 | - |
| (b) by students/graduates | 9 | 3 | - | 12 | 10 | - |
| (c) by administrators | 4 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 9 | - |
| b. Programs | | | | | | |
| (1) Department programs | - | 13 | - | 12 | 8 | - |
| (2) Other academic programs (e.g., internships, study abroad) | 3 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 7 | - |
| (3) Student development and support programs/services (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) ( specify _____) | 1 | 11 | - | 13 | 8 | - |
| c. Facilities (e.g., buildings, spaces for classes, studying, eating) (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) (specify _____) | 4 | 9 | - | 9 | 11 | - |
| d. Other (specify _____) | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |

. returned - 4
sponse rate - 80%

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

by Chief Academic Officer

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Please indicate which of the following has occurred at your institution within the last two years regarding the issues of assessment and the quality of education.

| | Yes | Planned | No | Don't know |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) |
| 1. Discussion | | | | |
| a. with members of the board/trustees/regents | 3 (75%) | - | - | 1 (25%) |
| b. among senior administrators | 4(100%) | - | - | - |
| c. in institutional faculty meetings | 2 (50%) | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | - |
| d. in some academic departments | 3(100%) | - | - | - |
| e. in some administrative departments | 4(100%) | - | - | - |
| f. in specially convened institutional meetings | - | - | 4(100%) | - |
| g. with outside consultants | 3 (75%) | - | 1 (25%) | - |
| 2. Establishment of a new task force/committee or assignment of an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education. | 1 (25%) | 1 (25%) | 2 (50%) | - |
| 3. Have established an assessment plan | - | 2 (50%) | 2 (50%) | - |

2. For each of the following, please indicate -
   A. to what extent the condition exists at your institution and
   B. given that condition, to what extent it serves as an obstacle to establishing/using an assessment program at your institution.

| | Extent of Condition at Your Institution | | | | | Condition as an Obstacle to Assessment at Your Institution | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Essentially not at all | A little | Somewhat | Much | Extensive | Not an obstacle | Minor obstacle | Major obstacle |
| a. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key administrators. | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - |
| | - | - | 25% | 50% | 25% | 75% | 25% | - |
| b. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key faculty/faculty committees. | - | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | 4 | - |
| | - | - | 75% | 25% | - | - | 100% | - |
| c. Pressure from the external environment (public, board members/regents, etc.) for assessment. | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 4 | - | - |
| | - | 25% | 50% | 25% | - | 100% | - | - |
| d. A clear sense of how to begin an assessment program. | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| | - | 25% | 75% | - | - | - | 25% | 75% |
| e. A clear sense of what to evaluate. | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| | - | 25% | 75% | - | - | - | 25% | 75% |
| f. General administrative support of the concept of assessment. | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| | - | - | 50% | - | 50% | 50% | 50% | - |
| g. General faculty support of the concept of assessment. | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | - | 50% | - | 50% | - | 25% | 50% | 25% |
| h. A perception that students would be unhappy with new forms of assessment. | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | - |
| | 75% | 25% | - | - | - | 75% | 25% | - |
| i. Fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching/learning activities. | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 50% | - | 25% | 25% | - | 50% | 25% | 25% |
| j. The opinion that assessment may be inappropriate for the insitution's curriculum. | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | - |
| | 15% | 50% | - | 25% | - | 25% | 75% | - |
| k. Fear about misuse of assessment results. | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 |
| | - | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | - | 50% | 50% |
| l. Perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments. | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 |
| | - | - | 50% | 25% | 25% | - | 50% | 50% |
| m. Availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment program. | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| | 25% | 25% | - | 50% | - | - | 25% | 75% |
| n. Expertise at institution to develop assessment procedures. | - | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 1 |
| | - | - | 75% | 25% | - | - | 75% | 25% |
| o. Expertise at institution to assist in interpreting and utilizing results. | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
| | - | - | 50% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 75% | - |
| p. A perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff. | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 |
| | - | - | 25% | 50% | 25% | - | 50% | 50% |

## Table 2a (continued)

3. a. What, if any, are additional obstacles to assessment at your institution that were not identified in question 2 on page 1? What opportunities for assessment exist at your institution?

b. To address the obstacles to assessment at your institution, please indicate what type of assistance, if any, your institution would find most helpful and which specific group you think could appropriately provide that assistance.

| n | Type of assistance most helpful (specify) | Appropriate source of assistance (check) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Other institutions | State Legislature | Institutional consortiums | State agencies | No specific group in min |
| 3 | Funding | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| 3 | Information | 3 | - | 3 | - | 1 |
| 1 | Model | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 | Instruments | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 | Workload | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

4. Do you know of individuals in your institution who have attended conferences/workshops devoted entirely to assessment (e.g., National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education Conference held in South Carolina in October 1985, Assessment in Higher Education Conference at the University of Minnesota in July 1986)?

| | | n | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Yes | 1 | 25% | If yes, please specify conference(s). Assessment in Higher Education Conference, U. of Minn., 198 |
| 2. | No | 3 | 75% | |

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Use of nationally standardized tests for purposes of student assessment risks distorting the educational process. | n | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | % | - | 25% | 25% | 50% | |
| b. | Student assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes and competencies, not on easily learned skills and knowledge. | n | - | 1 | - | 2 | |
| | | % | - | 25% | - | 50% | 25 |
| c. | Student assessment should be closely tied to efforts to improve instruction. | n | - | - | - | - | |
| | | % | - | - | - | - | 100 |
| d. | Student assessment should include substantial feedback to students. | n | - | - | 1 | 2 | |
| | | % | - | - | 25% | 50% | 25 |
| e. | Results of student assessment should be linked to analyses of institutional effectiveness. | n | - | - | - | 2 | |
| | | % | - | - | - | 50% | 50 |
| f. | Results of student assessment should be linked to institutional planning and budgeting. | n | - | - | - | 3 | |
| | | % | - | - | - | 75% | 25 |
| g. | All institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness. | n | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | % | - | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25 |
| h. | As a condition of accreditation, institutions should be required to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | - | - | 1 | 3 | |
| | | % | - | - | 25% | 75% | - |
| i. | States should require public institutions to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | - | - | 2 | 2 | |
| | | % | - | - | 50% | 50% | - |
| j. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in assisting us to better understand our functioning and how we could improve. | n | - | - | - | 3 | |
| | | % | - | - | - | 75% | 25 |
| k. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in its assistance to answer questions from outside the institution about our quality and effectiveness. | n | - | - | - | 3 | |
| | | % | - | - | - | 75% | 25 |

6. Other comments about assessment or quality of education issues:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA n=5

No. returned - 4
Response rate - 80%

Table 2b

Part B - To be completed by institutional researcher or equivalent

## SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Listed below are many types of information about students/graduates, each of which may be more appropriate for some institutions than for others. Please indicate which, if any, have been collected at some time during the last five years and for what purpose(s) (indicate as many purposes as apply).

| | Has information been collected within last five years? | | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, at entrance | Yes, during process | Yes, at exit | No | Program improvement | Meet student needs (e.g., placement, advising) | Account-ability | Don't know purpose |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| A. Areas of growth/development | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Basic cognitive skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) mathematical skills | 3 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 4 | - | - |
| (b) English composition/communication | 3 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | - |
| (c) reading | - | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| 2. Knowledge/understanding | | | | | | | | |
| (a) general education subjects (e.g., history, humanities, science) | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| (b) other specific content areas (e.g., area of major) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (c) technical subjects | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| 3. Higher level skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) critical thinking | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (b) problem solving | 1 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | - |
| (c) communication(e.g., to persuade) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (d) technical skills | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (e) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| 4. Affective understanding/skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) attitudes | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| (b) values | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| (c) human relations/leadership skills | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| B. Student Progress | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Withdrawals from courses | | 3 | 1 | - | 3 | - | 1 | - |
| 2. Repeats of courses | | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 3. Graduation rates | | | 3 | - | 3 | - | 2 | - |
| 4. Other (specify _____) | | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| C. General outcomes of graduates | | | Yes | No | | | | |
| 1. Enrollment in graduate/professional school | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | - |
| 2. Additional earned degrees(e.g., Diplomas, Associate, Bachelors) | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | - |
| 3. Advanced earned degrees (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | - |
| 4. Professional attainment | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | - |
| 5. Job Placement | | | 4 | - | 3 | | 2 | - |
| 6. Honors and other achievements | | | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | - |
| 7. Employer evaluation of job performance | | | 1 | 3 | 2 | | - | - |
| 8. Contribution to community | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | - |
| 9. Indices of alumni giving | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | - | 2 |
| 10. General satisfaction with education, etc. | | | 4 | - | 4 | | 1 | - |
| 11. Other (specify _____) | | | - | 2 | - | | - | - |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 2b (continued)

2. Which of the following aspects are evaluated at your institution and for what purpose(s) (indicate either or both purposes as applicable)?

| Aspect of Institution | Has an evaluation been conducted? | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, annually | Yes, at least once in last 5 years | No | Development/ Improvement | Accountability/ Administrative decisions | Don't know purpos |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| a. Personnel | | | | | | |
| (1) Administration | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 3 | - |
| (2) Faculty | | | | | | |
| (a) by peers | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | - |
| (b) by students/graduates | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 3 | - |
| (c) by administrators | 3 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - |
| b. Programs | | | | | | |
| (1) Department programs | - | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | - |
| (2) Other academic programs (e.g., internships, study abroad) | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | - |
| (3) Student development and support programs/services (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) ( specify _____) | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 | - |
| c. Facilities (e.g., buildings, spaces for classes, studying, eating) (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) (specify _____) | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | - |
| d. Other (specify _____) | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |

STATE UNIVERSITIES n=7
No. returned - 6
Response rate - 86%

Table 3a

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

Part A - To be completed by Chief Academic Officer

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Please indicate which of the following has occurred at your institution within the last two years regarding the issues of assessment and the quality of education.

| | Yes n | Yes % | Planned n | Planned % | No n | No % | Don't know n | Don't know % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Discussion | | | | | | | | |
| a. with members of the board/trustees/regents | 5 | (100%) | - | | - | | - | |
| b. among senior administrators | 6 | (100%) | - | | - | | - | |
| c. in institutional faculty meetings | 5 | (83%) | 1 | (17%) | - | | - | |
| d. in some academic departments | 6 | (100%) | - | | - | | - | |
| e. in some administrative departments | 5 | (83%) | - | | - | | 1 | (17%) |
| f. in specially convened institutional meetings | 4 | (67%) | 1 | (17%) | 1 | (17%) | - | |
| g. with outside consultants | 2 | (33%) | 1 | (17%) | 3 | (50%) | - | |
| 2. Establishment of a new task force/committee or assignment of an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education. | 4 | (67%) | 1 | (17%) | 1 | (17%) | - | |
| 3. Have established an assessment plan | 2 | (40%) | 2 | (40%) | 1 | (20%) | - | |

2. For each of the following, please indicate -
   A. to what extent the condition exists at your institution and
   B. given that condition, to what extent it serves as an obstacle to establishing/using an assessment program at your institution.

| | Extent of Condition at Your Institution | | | | | | Condition as an Obstacle to Assessment at Your Institution | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Essentially not at all | A little | Somewhat | Much | Extensive | | Not an obstacle | Minor obstacle | Major obstacle |
| a. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key administrators. | - | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | - |
| | - | - | 17% | 50% | 33% | | 83% | 17% | - |
| b. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key faculty/faculty committees. | - | - | 4 | - | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | - | - | 67% | - | 33% | | 50% | 33% | 17% |
| c. Pressure from the external environment (public, board members/regents, etc.) for assessment. | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | - |
| | - | 33% | 33% | 17% | 17% | | 80% | 20% | - |
| d. A clear sense of how to begin an assessment program. | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | - | 17% | 33% | 17% | 33% | | 50% | 33% | 17% |
| e. A clear sense of what to evaluate. | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | - | 17% | 33% | 33% | 17% | | 50% | 33% | 17% |
| f. General administrative support of the concept of assessment. | - | - | - | 4 | 2 | | 6 | - | - |
| | - | - | - | 67% | 33% | | 100% | - | - |
| g. General faculty support of the concept of assessment. | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | 17% | - | 50% | 17% | 17% | | 33% | 50% | 17% |
| h. A perception that students would be unhappy with new forms of assessment. | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | - | | 3 | 3 | - |
| | 33% | 50% | 17% | - | - | | 50% | 50% | - |
| i. Fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching/learning activities. | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | - | | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | 17% | - | 50% | 33% | - | | 17% | 50% | 33% |
| j. The opinion that assessment may be inappropriate for the insitution's curriculum. | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | - | | 5 | - | 1 |
| | 50% | 17% | 33% | - | - | | 83% | - | 17% |
| k. Fear about misuse of assessment results. | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | - | 17% | 33% | 33% | 17% | | 17% | 33% | 50% |
| l. Perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments. | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | - | 17% | 50% | 33% | - | | 17% | 50% | 33% |
| m. Availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment program. | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | | - | 3 | 3 |
| | 17% | 50% | 17% | - | 17% | | - | 50% | 50% |
| n. Expertise at institution to develop assessment procedures. | - | 1 | - | 4 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | - |
| | - | 17% | - | 67% | 17% | | 67% | 33% | - |
| o. Expertise at institution to assist in interpreting and utilizing results. | - | - | - | 4 | 2 | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | - | - | - | 67% | 33% | | 67% | 17% | 17% |
| p. A perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff. | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | 17% | - | 33% | 17% | 33% | | 33% | 17% | 50% |

3. a. What, if any, are additional obstacles to assessment at your institution that were not identified in question 2 on page 1? What opportunities for assessment exist at your institution?

Obstacle

1 Complexity and diversity of institution

b. To address the obstacles to assessment at your institution, please indicate what type of assistance, if any, your institution would find most helpful and which specific group you think could appropriately provide that assistance.

| n | Type of assistance most helpful (specify) | Appropriate source of assistance (check) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Other institutions | State Legislature | Institutional consortiums | State agencies | No specific group in mind |
| 5 | Funding | - | 5 | - | 1 | - |
| 4 | Expertise | 3 | - | 2 | - | - |
| 2 | Conference | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 | Instruments | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| 1 | Model | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

4. Do you know of individuals in your institution who have attended conferences/workshops devoted entirely to assessment (e.g., National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education Conference held in South Carolina in October 1985, Assessment in Higher Education Conference at the University of Minnesota in July 1986)?

| | | n | % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Yes | 3 | 60% | If yes, please specify conference(s). ACT Conferences (n=1), National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, S.C. (n=1), Assessment in Higher Education Conference, U. of Minn. (n=2), CLEP: Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education (n=1) |
| 2. | No | 2 | 40% | |

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Use of nationally standardized tests for purposes of student assessment risks distorting the educational process. | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | - |
| | | - | 33% | 33% | 33% | - |
| b. | Student assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes and competencies, not on easily learned skills and knowledge. | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | | - | 17% | 17% | 33% | 33% |
| c. | Student assessment should be closely tied to efforts to improve instruction. | - | - | - | 3 | 3 |
| | | - | - | - | 50% | 50% |
| d. | Student assessment should include substantial feedback to students. | - | - | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | | - | - | 17% | 50% | 33% |
| e. | Results of student assessment should be linked to analyses of institutional effectiveness. | - | - | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | | - | - | 17% | 50% | 33% |
| f. | Results of student assessment should be linked to institutional planning and budgeting. | - | - | - | 3 | 3 |
| | | - | - | - | 50% | 50% |
| g. | All institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness. | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 |
| | | 33% | 17% | 33% | - | 17% |
| h. | As a condition of accreditation, institutions should be required to show evidence of their effectiveness. | 1 | - | - | 4 | 1 |
| | | 17% | - | - | 67% | 17% |
| i. | States should require public institutions to show evidence of their effectiveness. | - | - | 2 | 4 | - |
| | | - | - | 33% | 67% | - |
| j. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in assisting us to better understand our functioning and how we could improve. | - | - | - | 1 | 4 |
| | | - | - | - | 20% | 80% |
| k. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in its assistance to answer questions from outside the institution about our quality and effectiveness. | - | 1 | 2 | - | 3 |
| | | - | 17% | 33% | - | 50% |

6. Other comments about assessment or quality of education issues:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Thank you for your assistance.

No. returned - 6
Response rate - 86%

Table 3b

Completed by institutional researcher or equivalent

## SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Listed below are many types of information about students/graduates, each of which may be more appropriate for some institutions than for others. Please indicate which, if any, have been collected at some time during the last five years and for what purpose(s) (indicate as many purposes as apply).

| | Has information been collected within last five years? | | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, at entrance | Yes, during process | Yes, at exit | No | Program improvement | Meet student needs (e.g., placement, advising) | Account-ability | Don't know purpose |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| **A. Areas of growth/development** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Basic cognitive skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) mathematical skills | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | - |
| (b) English composition/communication | 5 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 5 | 2 | - |
| (c) reading | 3 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| 2. Knowledge/understanding | | | | | | | | |
| (a) general education subjects (e.g., history, humanities, science) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - |
| (b) other specific content areas (e.g., area of major) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | - |
| (c) technical subjects | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 3. Higher level skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) critical thinking | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - |
| (b) problem solving | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| (c) communication(e.g., to persuade) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| (d) technical skills | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| (e) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| 4. Affective understanding/skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) attitudes | 1 | - | - | 3 | - | - | 1 | - |
| (b) values | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| (c) human relations/leadership skills | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| **B. Student Progress** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Withdrawals from courses | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - |
| 2. Repeats of courses | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - |
| 3. Graduation rates | | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | - |
| 4. Other (specify _____) | | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| **C. General outcomes of graduates** | | | Yes | No | | | | |
| 1. Enrollment in graduate/professional school | | | 4 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | - |
| 2. Additional earned degrees(e.g., Diplomas, Associate, Bachelors) | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | | 2 | - |
| 3. Advanced earned degrees (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 2 | - |
| 4. Professional attainment | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 2 | - |
| 5. Job Placement | | | 6 | - | 4 | | 5 | - |
| 6. Honors and other achievements | | | 4 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | - |
| 7. Employer evaluation of job performance | | | - | 5 | - | | - | - |
| 8. Contribution to community | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 2 | - |
| 9. Indices of alumni giving | | | 6 | - | 2 | | 3 | - |
| 10. General satisfaction with education, etc. | | | 4 | 2 | 3 | | 4 | - |
| 11. Other (specify _____) | | | 3 | - | 1 | | 1 | - |

## Table 3b (continued)

2. Which of the following aspects are evaluated at your institution and for what purpose(s) (indicate either or both purposes as applicable)?

| Aspect of Institution | Has an evaluation been conducted? | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, annually | Yes, at least once in last 5 years | No | Development/ Improvement | Accountability/ Administrative decisions | Don't know purpo |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| a. Personnel | | | | | | |
| (1) Administration | 6 | - | - | 6 | 4 | - |
| (2) Faculty | | | | | | |
| (a) by peers | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | - |
| (b) by students/graduates | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | - |
| (c) by administrators | 5 | 1 | - | 5 | 4 | - |
| b. Programs | | | | | | |
| (1) Department programs | 1 | 5 | - | 6 | 3 | - |
| (2) Other academic programs (e.g., internships, study abroad) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | - |
| (3) Student development and support programs/services (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) ( specify _____) | 1 | 5 | - | 5 | 3 | - |
| c. Facilities (e.g., buildings, spaces for classes, studying, eating) (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) (specify _____) | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 3 | - |
| d. Other (specify _____) | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 4a

COMMUNITY COLLEGES n=18

No. returned - 16
Response rate - 89%

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

Part A - To be completed by Chief Academic Officer

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Please indicate which of the following has occurred at your institution within the last two years regarding the issues of assessment and the quality of education.

| | Yes n (%) | Planned n (%) | No n (%) | Don't know n (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Discussion | | | | |
| a. with members of the board/trustees/regents | 11 (73%) | - ( %) | 2 (13%) | 2 (13%) |
| b. among senior administrators | 15 (94%) | - ( %) | 1 ( 6%) | - |
| c. in institutional faculty meetings | 13 (87%) | 1 ( 7%) | 1 ( 7%) | - |
| d. in some academic departments | 13 (82%) | 1 ( 6%) | 1 ( 6%) | 1 ( 6%) |
| e. in some administrative departments | 13 (87%) | - ( %) | 1 ( 7%) | 1 ( 7%) |
| f. in specially convened institutional meetings | 8 (53%) | 1 ( 7%) | 6 (40%) | - |
| g. with outside consultants | 7 (47%) | 2 (13%) | 6 (40%) | - |
| 2. Establishment of a new task force/committee or assignment of an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education. | 5 (31%) | 3 (19%) | 8 (50%) | - |
| 3. Have established an assessment plan | 8 (50%) | 4 (25%) | 4 (25%) | - |

2. For each of the following, please indicate -
   A. to what extent the condition exists at your institution and
   B. given that condition, to what extent it serves as an obstacle to establishing/using an assessment program at your institution.

| | Extent of Condition at Your Institution | | | | | Condition as an Obstacle to Assessment at Your Institution | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Essentially not at all | A little | Somewhat | Much | Extensive | Not an obstacle | Minor obstacle | Major obstacle |
| a. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key administrators. | n - | 1 7% | 3 20% | 8 53% | 3 20% | 10 67% | 3 20% | 2 13% |
| b. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key faculty/faculty committees. | 2 13% | 1 7% | 6 40% | 5 33% | 1 7% | 8 53% | 4 27% | 3 20% |
| c. Pressure from the external environment (public, board members/regents, etc.) for assessment. | 3 20% | 4 27% | 7 47% | 1 7% | - | 14 93% | 1 7% | - |
| d. A clear sense of how to begin an assessment program. | 1 7% | 5 33% | 4 27% | 3 20% | 2 13% | 6 40% | 6 40% | 3 20% |
| e. A clear sense of what to evaluate. | 3 20% | 3 20% | 3 20% | 4 27% | 2 13% | 7 47% | 5 33% | 3 20% |
| f. General administrative support of the concept of assessment. | 1 7% | 1 7% | 2 13% | 8 53% | 3 20% | 11 73% | 3 20% | 1 7% |
| g. General faculty support of the concept of assessment. | 1 7% | 4 27% | 6 40% | 4 27% | - | 7 47% | 5 33% | 3 20% |
| h. A perception that students would be unhappy with new forms of assessment. | 7 47% | 5 33% | 2 13% | - | 1 7% | 9 60% | 5 33% | 1 7% |
| i. Fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching/learning activities. | 2 13% | 5 33% | 5 33% | 2 13% | 1 7% | 6 40% | 5 33% | 4 27% |
| j. The opinion that assessment may be inappropriate for the insitution's curriculum. | 7 47% | 3 20% | 3 20% | 1 7% | 1 7% | 7 47% | 6 40% | 2 13% |
| k. Fear about misuse of assessment results. | 3 20% | 5 33% | 5 33% | - | 2 13% | 4 29% | 7 50% | 3 21% |
| l. Perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments. | 2 13% | 1 7% | 10 67% | 1 7% | 1 7% | 2 13% | 11 73% | 2 13% |
| m. Availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment program. | 3 20% | - | 5 33% | 3 20% | 4 27% | - | 6 40% | 9 60% |
| n. Expertise at institution to develop assessment procedures. | 3 20% | 4 27% | 6 40% | 1 7% | 1 7% | 4 27% | 8 53% | 3 20% |
| o. Expertise at institution to assist in interpreting and utilizing results. | 4 27% | 3 20% | 5 33% | 3 20% | - | 6 40% | 6 40% | 3 20% |
| p. A perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff. | - | 2 13% | 2 13% | 5 33% | 6 40% | - | 4 27% | 11 73% |

3. a. What, if any, are additional obstacles to assessment at your institution that were not identified in question 2 on page 1? What opportunities for assessment exist at your institution?

b. To address the obstacles to assessment at your institution, please indicate what type of assistance, if any, your institution would find most helpful and which specific group you think could appropriately provide that assistance.

| Type of assistance most helpful (specify) | | Appropriate source of assistance (check) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| n | | Other institutions | State Legislature | Institutional consortiums | State agencies | No specific group in mind |
| 10 | Funding | - | 9 | - | 2 | - |
| 3 | Training | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| 2 | Models | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| 2 | Consultants | 2 | - | 1 | - | - |
| 2 | State wide program | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 1 | Information | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

4. Do you know of individuals in your institution who have attended conferences/workshops devoted entirely to assessment (e.g., National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education Conference held in South Carolina in October 1985, Assessment in Higher Education Conference at the University of Minnesota in July 1986)?

| | n | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Yes | 4 | 27% | If yes, please specify conference(s). Community College Workshops (n=1) National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, S.C. (n=1) Assessment in Higher Education Conference, U. of Minn. (n=1) |
| 2. No | 11 | 73% | |

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Use of nationally standardized tests for purposes of student assessment risks distorting the educational process. | 1<br>6% | 5<br>31% | 5<br>31% | 4<br>25% | 1<br>6% |
| b. | Student assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes and competencies, not on easily learned skills and knowledge. | -<br>- | 1<br>6% | 3<br>19% | 9<br>56% | 3<br>19% |
| c. | Student assessment should be closely tied to efforts to improve instruction. | -<br>- | 1<br>6% | -<br>- | 8<br>50% | 7<br>44% |
| d. | Student assessment should include substantial feedback to students. | -<br>- | -<br>- | -<br>- | 10<br>63% | 6<br>38% |
| e. | Results of student assessment should be linked to analyses of institutional effectiveness. | 1<br>6% | 1<br>6% | 2<br>13% | 10<br>63% | 2<br>13% |
| f. | Results of student assessment should be linked to institutional planning and budgeting. | -<br>- | -<br>- | -<br>- | 12<br>80% | 3<br>20% |
| g. | All institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness. | 1<br>6% | 2<br>13% | 3<br>19% | 8<br>50% | 2<br>13% |
| h. | As a condition of accreditation, institutions should be required to show evidence of their effectiveness. | 1<br>7% | 1<br>7% | 3<br>20% | 7<br>47% | 3<br>20% |
| i. | States should require public institutions to show evidence of their effectiveness. | 1<br>6% | 2<br>13% | 2<br>13% | 10<br>63% | 1<br>6% |
| j. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in assisting us to better understand our functioning and how we could improve. | 1<br>6% | 1<br>6% | -<br>- | 10<br>63% | 4<br>25% |
| k. | An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in its assistance to answer questions from outside the institution about our quality and effectiveness. | 1<br>6% | 1<br>6% | 2<br>13% | 9<br>56% | 3<br>19% |

6. Other comments about assessment or quality of education issues:



Thank you for your assistance.

Community Colleges N=18
No. returned - 15
Response rate - 83%

Table 4b

Institutional researcher or equivalent

## SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

Listed below are many types of information about students/graduates, each of which may be more appropriate for some institutions than for others. Please indicate which, if any, have been collected at some time during the last five years and for what purpose(s) (indicate as many purposes as apply).

| | Has information been collected within last five years? | | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, at entrance | Yes, during process | Yes, at exit | No | Program improvement | Meet student needs (e.g., placement, advising) | Account-ability | Don't know purpose |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| **A. Areas of growth/development** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Basic cognitive skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) mathematical skills | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 2 | - |
| (b) English composition/communication | 14 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 13 | 3 | - |
| (c) reading | 11 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 2 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
| 2. Knowledge/understanding | | | | | | | | |
| (a) general education subjects (e.g., history, humanities, science) | - | 2 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| (b) other specific content areas (e.g., area of major) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| (c) technical subjects | -- | 2 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 3. Higher level skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) critical thinking | - | 2 | - | 13 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| (b) problem solving | - | 2 | - | 13 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| (c) communication(e.g., to persuade) | - | 1 | - | 14 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| (d) technical skills | - | 2 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| (e) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| 4. Affective understanding/skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) attitudes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| (b) values | 1 | 2 | - | 12 | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| (c) human relations/leadership skills | - | 1 | - | 13 | - | 1 | - | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - |
| **B. Student Progress** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Withdrawals from courses | | 10 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 7 | - |
| 2. Repeats of courses | | 6 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | - |
| 3. Graduation rates | | | 11 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 7 | - |
| 4. Other (specify _____) | | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| **C. General outcomes of graduates** | | | Yes | No | | | | |
| 1. Enrollment in graduate/professional school | | | 5 | 9 | 2 | | 4 | 1 |
| 2. Additional earned degrees(e.g., Diplomas, Associate, Bachelors) | | | 6 | 8 | 2 | | 3 | 2 |
| 3. Advanced earned degrees (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) | | | 3 | 10 | 1 | | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Professional attainment | | | 4 | 9 | 2 | | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Job Placement | | | 13 | 2 | 5 | | 8 | 1 |
| 6. Honors and other achievements | | | 6 | 7 | 4 | | 2 | 1 |
| 7. Employer evaluation of job performance | | | 4 | 9 | 4 | | - | - |
| 8. Contribution to community | | | 1 | 12 | 1 | | - | - |
| 9. Indices of alumni giving | | | 2 | 11 | 2 | | - | - |
| 10. General satisfaction with education, etc. | | | 11 | 4 | 10 | | 5 | - |
| 11. Other (specify _____) | | | 1 | 3 | - | | 1 | - |

## Table 4b (continued)

2. Which of the following aspects are evaluated at your institution and for what purpose(s) (indicate either or both purposes as applicable)?

| Aspect of Institution | Has an evaluation been conducted? | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, annually | Yes, at least once in last 5 years | No | Development/ Improvement | Accountability/ Administrative decisions | Don't know purpos |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| a. Personnel | | | | | | |
| (1) Administration | 10 | 4 | - | 12 | 8 | - |
| (2) Faculty | | | | | | |
| (a) by peers | 1 | 1 | 7 | - | - | - |
| (b) by students/graduates | 7 | 6 | - | 12 | 2 | - |
| (c) by administrators | 5 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 5 | - |
| b. Programs | | | | | | |
| (1) Department programs | 3 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 4 | - |
| (2) Other academic programs (e.g., internships, study abroad) | 2 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 1 | - |
| (3) Student development and support programs/services (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) ( specify _____) | 4 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 2 | - |
| c. Facilities (e.g., buildings, spaces for classes, studying, eating) (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) (specify _____) | 4 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 5 | - |
| d. Other (specify _____) | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - |

AREA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTES n=33

Table 5a

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

Part A - to be completed by Chief Academic Officer

No. returned - 30
Response rate - 91%

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Please indicate which of the following has occurred at your institution within the last two years regarding the issues of assessment and the quality of education.

| | Yes | | Planned | | No | | Don't know | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| 1. Discussion | | | | | | | | |
| a. with members of the board/trustees/regents | 24 | (83%) | 1 | ( 3%) | 4 | (14%) | | - |
| b. among senior administrators | 28 | (97%) | 1 | ( 3%) | | - | | - |
| c. in institutional faculty meetings | 27 | (90%) | | - | 2 | ( 7%) | 1 | ( 3%) |
| d. in some academic departments | 28 | (100%) | | - | | - | | - |
| e. in some administrative departments | 29 | (97%) | | - | 1 | ( 3%) | | - |
| f. in specially convened institutional meetings | 22 | (76%) | 1 | ( 3%) | 6 | (21%) | | - |
| g. with outside consultants | 22 | (73%) | 1 | ( 3%) | 7 | (23%) | | - |
| 2. Establishment of a new task force/committee or assignment of an existing committee to address the issues of assessment and quality of undergraduate education. | 15 | (52%) | 6 | (21%) | 8 | (28%) | | - |
| 3. Have established an assessment plan | 17 | (57%) | 7 | (23%) | 6 | (20%) | | - |

2. For each of the following, please indicate -
   A. to what extent the condition exists at your institution and
   B. given that condition, to what extent it serves as an obstacle to establishing/using an assessment program at your institution.

| | Extent of Condition at Your Institution | | | | | Condition as an Obstacle to Assessment at Your Institution | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Essentially not at all | A little | Somewhat | Much | Extensive | Not an obstacle | Minor obstacle | Major obstacle |
| a. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key administrators. | 1<br>3% | -<br>- | 5<br>17% | 15<br>50% | 9<br>30% | 27<br>90% | 1<br>3% | 2<br>7% |
| b. Awareness of assessment issues on the part of key faculty/faculty committees. | 1<br>3% | 3<br>10% | 9<br>30% | 10<br>33% | 7<br>23% | 19<br>63% | 10<br>33% | 1<br>3% |
| c. Pressure from the external environment (public, board members/regents, etc.) for assessment. | 5<br>17% | 7<br>23% | 12<br>40% | 3<br>10% | 3<br>10% | 23<br>77% | 6<br>20% | 1<br>3% |
| d. A clear sense of how to begin an assessment program. | 1<br>3% | 7<br>23% | 9<br>30% | 8<br>27% | 5<br>17% | 16<br>53% | 12<br>40% | 2<br>7% |
| e. A clear sense of what to evaluate. | -<br>- | 5<br>17% | 11<br>37% | 10<br>33% | 4<br>13% | 13<br>43% | 13<br>43% | 4<br>13% |
| f. General administrative support of the concept of assessment. | -<br>- | -<br>- | 4<br>13% | 13<br>43% | 13<br>43% | 26<br>87% | 2<br>7% | 2<br>7% |
| g. General faculty support of the concept of assessment. | 1<br>3% | 3<br>10% | 12<br>40% | 12<br>40% | 2<br>7% | 11<br>37% | 17<br>57% | 2<br>7% |
| h. A perception that students would be unhappy with new forms of assessment. | 14<br>47% | 7<br>23% | 9<br>30% | -<br>- | -<br>- | 18<br>62% | 11<br>38% | -<br>- |
| i. Fear about possible intrusion of assessment on teaching/learning activities. | 5<br>17% | 8<br>27% | 15<br>50% | 2<br>7% | -<br>- | 11<br>37% | 16<br>53% | 3<br>10% |
| j. The opinion that assessment may be inappropriate for the insitution's curriculum. | 16<br>53% | 4<br>13% | 10<br>33% | -<br>- | -<br>- | 16<br>53% | 14<br>47% | -<br>- |
| k. Fear about misuse of assessment results. | 5<br>17% | 8<br>27% | 14<br>47% | 3<br>10% | -<br>- | 7<br>24% | 19<br>66% | 3<br>10% |
| l. Perceived inadequacy of available evaluation instruments. | 4<br>13% | 5<br>17% | 16<br>53% | 5<br>17% | -<br>- | 9<br>30% | 16<br>53% | 5<br>17% |
| m. Availability of sufficient funds to develop assessment program. | 2<br>7% | 3<br>10% | 9<br>30% | 10<br>33% | 6<br>20% | 1<br>3% | 13<br>43% | 16<br>53% |
| n. Expertise at institution to develop assessment procedures. | 2<br>7% | 8<br>27% | 11<br>37% | 7<br>23% | 2<br>7% | 9<br>30% | 14<br>47% | 7<br>23% |
| o. Expertise at institution to assist in interpreting and utilizing results. | 3<br>10% | 6<br>20% | 11<br>37% | 8<br>27% | 2<br>7% | 12<br>40% | 13<br>43% | 5<br>17% |
| p. A perception that assessment would add to an already heavy workload for staff. | 1<br>3% | 5<br>17% | 12<br>40% | 6<br>20% | 6<br>20% | 4<br>13% | 14<br>47% | 12<br>40% |

3. a. What, if any, are additional obstacles to assessment at your institution that were not identified in question 2 on page 1? What opportunities for assessment exist at your institution?

Obstacles

5 Time
1 Types of assessment at program level
1 Space

b. To address the obstacles to assessment at your institution, please indicate what type of assistance, if any, your institution would find most helpful and which specific group you think could appropriately provide that assistance.

| n | Type of assistance most helpful (specify) | Appropriate source of assistance (check) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Other institutions | State Legislature | Institutional consortiums | State agencies | No specific group in mind |
| 15 | Funding | - | 14 | - | 5 | - |
| 7 | Technical assistance/consultants | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 4 | Instruments | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | Training | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| 2 | Models | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | Information | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 1 | Meetings | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| 1 | Coordinated assessment | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| 1 | Public assessment of institution | - | - | - | 1 | - |

4. Do you know of individuals in your institution who have attended conferences/workshops devoted entirely to assessment (e.g., National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education Conference held in South Carolina in October 1985, Assessment in Higher Education Conference at the University of Minnesota in July 1986)?

| | n | % | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Yes | 5 | 19% | If yes, please specify conference(s). Minnesota Area Vocational Technical Student Services Assoc(n=1), Prep for NCA Visitation, Chicago (n=1), National Curriculum Council (n=1), North Central AASA Conference (n=1), State Conferences through the AVTI System (n=1) |
| 2. No | 22 | 82% | |

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Use of nationally standardized tests for purposes of student assessment risks distorting the educational process. | n | 2 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 1 |
| | % | 7% | 38% | 24% | 28% | 3% |
| b. Student assessment should focus on broadly defined outcomes and competencies, not on easily learned skills and knowledge. | n | 3 | 11 | 2 | 12 | 2 |
| | % | 10% | 37% | 7% | 40% | 7% |
| c. Student assessment should be closely tied to efforts to improve instruction. | n | 1 | - | 1 | 15 | 13 |
| | % | 3% | - | 3% | 50% | 43% |
| d. Student assessment should include substantial feedback to students. | n | - | - | 2 | 16 | 12 |
| | % | - | - | 7% | 53% | 40% |
| e. Results of student assessment should be linked to analyses of institutional effectiveness. | n | - | - | 5 | 21 | 4 |
| | % | - | - | 17% | 70% | 13% |
| f. Results of student assessment should be linked to institutional planning and budgeting. | n | - | 1 | 3 | 22 | 4 |
| | % | - | 3% | 10% | 73% | 13% |
| g. All institutions should develop and publish evidence of their effectiveness. | n | 1 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 6 |
| | % | 3% | 13% | 17% | 47% | 20% |
| h. As a condition of accreditation, institutions should be required to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | - | 1 | 6 | 17 | 6 |
| | % | - | 3% | 20% | 57% | 20% |
| i. States should require public institutions to show evidence of their effectiveness. | n | 1 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 6 |
| | % | 3% | 7% | 10% | 60% | 20% |
| j. An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in assisting us to better understand our functioning and how we could improve. | n | - | 2 | 3 | 19 | 6 |
| | % | - | 7% | 10% | 63% | 20% |
| k. An assessment program at our institution would be valuable in its assistance to answer questions from outside the institution about our quality and effectiveness. | n | - | 2 | 5 | 18 | 4 |
| | % | - | 7% | 17% | 62% | 14% |

6. Other comments about assessment or quality of education issues:

AREA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTES n=33

No. returned - 29
Response rate - 88%

Table 5b

Part B - To be completed by institutional researcher or equivalent

# SURVEY ON THE STATUS OF ASSESSMENT IN MINNESOTA

*Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to the answer that applies.*

1. Listed below are many types of information about students/graduates, each of which may be more appropriate for some institutions than for others. Please indicate which, if any, have been collected at some time during the last five years and for what purpose(s) (indicate as many purposes as apply).

| | Has information been collected within last five years? | | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, at entrance | Yes, during process | Yes, at exit | No | Program improvement | Meet student needs (e.g., placement, advising) | Accountability | Don't know purpose |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| A. Areas of growth/development | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Basic cognitive skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) mathematical skills | 20 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 25 | 2 | - |
| (b) English composition/communication | 10 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 2 | - |
| (c) reading | 21 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 24 | 2 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | 2 | 1 | - | 7 | 1 | 4 | - | - |
| 2. Knowledge/understanding | | | | | | | | |
| (a) general education subjects (e.g., history, humanities, science) | - | 2 | - | 24 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| (b) other specific content areas (e.g., area of major) | 4 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 5 | 6 | 5 | - |
| (c) technical subjects | 7 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 7 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | 1 | - | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| 3. Higher level skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) critical thinking | - | 2 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 1 | - |
| (b) problem solving | - | 4 | 1 | 19 | - | 3 | 2 | - |
| (c) communication(e.g., to persuade) | - | 6 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 2 | - |
| (d) technical skills | 4 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 10 | 6 | |
| (e) other (specify _____) | - | 1 | - | 11 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 4. Affective understanding/skills | | | | | | | | |
| (a) attitudes | 2 | 5 | - | 19 | 1 | 6 | - | - |
| (b) values | 1 | 6 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 7 | 1 | - |
| (c) human relations/leadership skills | 2 | 10 | 2 | 16 | 4 | 10 | 1 | - |
| (d) other (specify _____) | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - |
| B. Student Progress | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Withdrawals from courses | | 11 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 21 | - |
| 2. Repeats of courses | | 12 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 9 | - |
| 3. Graduation rates | | | 16 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 20 | - |
| 4. Other (specify _____) | | - | 1 | 5 | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| C. General outcomes of graduates | | | Yes | No | | | | |
| 1. Enrollment in graduate/professional school | | | 5 | 20 | 1 | | 5 | 1 |
| 2. Additional earned degrees(e.g., Diplomas, Associate, Bachelors) | | | 7 | 19 | 2 | | 5 | - |
| 3. Advanced earned degrees (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) | | | 2 | 24 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Professional attainment | | | 6 | 17 | 4 | | 3 | 1 |
| 5. Job Placement | | | 28 | - | 16 | | 22 | - |
| 6. Honors and other achievements | | | 6 | 18 | 2 | | 4 | 1 |
| 7. Employer evaluation of job performance | | | 20 | 3 | 14 | | 17 | - |
| 8. Contribution to community | | | 3 | 19 | 1 | | 3 | - |
| 9. Indices of alumni giving | | | 1 | 21 | 1 | | - | - |
| 10. General satisfaction with education, etc. | | | 24 | 3 | 15 | | 18 | - |
| 11. Other (specify _____) | | | - | 6 | - | | - | - |

## Table 5b (continued)

2. Which of the following aspects are evaluated at your institution and for what purpose(s) (indicate either or both purposes as applicable)?

| Aspect of Institution | Has an evaluation been conducted? | | | If yes, indicate as many purposes as apply. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes, annually | Yes, at least once in last 5 years | No | Development/ Improvement | Accountability/ Administrative decisions | Don't know purpo |
| | n | n | n | n | n | n |
| a. Personnel | | | | | | |
| (1) Administration | 15 | 13 | - | 25 | 21 | - |
| (2) Faculty | | | | | | |
| (a) by peers | 3 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 6 | - |
| (b) by students/graduates | 12 | 14 | - | 25 | 14 | - |
| (c) by administrators | 13 | 15 | - | 24 | 17 | - |
| b. Programs | | | | | | |
| (1) Department programs | 7 | 21 | - | 26 | 17 | - |
| (2) Other academic programs (e.g., internships, study abroad) | 5 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 8 | - |
| (3) Student development and support programs/services (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) ( specify _____) | 9 | 16 | 1 | 23 | 16 | - |
| c. Facilities (e.g., buildings, spaces for classes, studying, eating) (availability, quality, utilization, etc.) (specify _____) | 9 | 19 | 1 | 24 | 19 | - |
| d. Other (specify _____) | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |